IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

TUESDAY, THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI BILAL NAZKI, THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

and

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G.CHANDRAIAH

WRIT APPEAL NO : 1069 of 2005

(Writ Appeal under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent against the Order dated 01/02/2005 in WP NO : 1237 OF 2005 on the file of the High Court.)

Between:

1 Jai Jawahar Nagar Co.operative House Building Society

Limited, Alwal, rep., by its Secretary B.Machander Rao
(As mentioned in the cause title in the WP No.1237/2005) rep.,

by its Secretary Sri B.S.Gill
2 B.S.Gill, s/o I.S.Gill, r/o 1-17-40, Ramnagar Colony, Alwal,

Malkajgiri Mandal, R.R.District.

..... APPELLANTS

AND

1 P.Sarojini Devi, w/o Ananda Rao,
r/o H.No.1-17-14, Ramnagar Colony Alwal, Secunderabad.
2 The Government of A.P., rep., by its Secretary to Revenue,

Secretariat, Hyderabad.
3 The Special Officer and Competent Authority, Urban Land

Ceiling, Hyderabad.
4 The Alwal Municipality, rep., by its Commissioner, Alwal, Ranga

Reddy District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Appellants: MR.K.V.BHANU PRASAD

Counsel for Respondent No.1: MR.G.PEDDA BABU

Counsel for Respondents 2 & 3: G.P.for Revenue

Counsel for Respondent No.4: Mr.P.Radha Krishna, Standing Counsel for Municipalities.

The Court at the stage of admission made the following

J U D G M E N T: (Per the Hon'ble Sri Bilal Nazki, ACJ):

The writ petitioner had filed the writ petition contending that she had made series of representations to the third respondent-Municipality bringing to its notice some alleged illegal activities being carried on by the fifth respondent in collusion with the fourth respondent. The learned Single Judge found that there was no evidence showing that any representation had been made by the petitioner to the Municipality. However, the learned Single Judge gave liberty to the writ petitioner to file a representation within four weeks from the date of the order and directed respondents 1 to 3 to pass appropriate orders within a period of six weeks thereafter. We do not find any ground to interfere in the order of the learned Single Judge. No illegality is pointed out in the order passed by the learned Single Judge. The writ appeal is misconceived, which is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

_____

(Bilal Nazki, ACJ)

14th June, 2005.

_____

(G. Chandraiah, J)

vrn

To

1 The Secretary to Revenue, Government of A.P., Secretariat,

Hyderabad.
2 The Special Officer and Competent Authority, Urban Land

Ceiling, Hyderabad.
3 The Commissioner, Alwal Municipality, Alwal, Ranga Reddy

District.

4 Two C.Cs to the Government Pleader for Revenue, High Court

Buildings, A.P., Hyderabad (OUT)

5 Two CD copies